

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-17 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.

By way of summary, the Office rejected Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Craig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708 B1, hereinafter “Craig”) in view of Tso et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,298 B1, hereinafter “Tso”) and Tracton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378 B1, hereinafter “Tracton”).

ABSTRACT

Applicants have replaced the Abstract with a new Abstract submitted herewith. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Craig in view of Tso and Tracton. In light of that rejection, independent Claims 1 and 12-14 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention and to thereby more clearly patentably define over the applied references.

Claim 1 recites an information processing apparatus including, in part, “means . . . for controlling said means for outputting to output said content data stored by said means for storing without an inquiry via the network when said means for detecting detects that said means for storing is storing said content data independently of said page information” Applicants respectfully submit that Craig, Tso, and Tracton fail to suggest or disclose those features.

Craig concerns “caching the Java Beans that are produced as a result of a JSP access, rather than trying to cache the generated datastream.”¹ The Office concedes that Craig fails to disclose “means . . . for controlling said means for outputting to output said content data stored by said means for storing without inquiry via the network when said content data is stored in said means for storing.”² Applicants respectfully submit that Craig also fails to disclose or suggest “means . . . for controlling said means for outputting to output said content data stored by said means for storing without an inquiry via the network when said means for detecting detects that said means for storing is storing said content data independently of said page information,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Tso concerns a cache management system, in which “Cache items include web pages or HTML documents that include HTML text plus images [and] audio”³

That is, Tso merely describes caching web pages or HTML documents that include images and audio. Tso does not describe caching the images and audio independently of the web pages or HTML documents. It is respectfully submitted that Tso fails to disclose or suggest “means . . . for controlling said means for outputting to output said content data stored by said means for storing without an inquiry via the network when said means for detecting detects that said means for storing is storing said content data independently of said page information,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Tracton concerns a server that “can be configured to have an original source content 250 to which is applied a scaler 252 that dynamically transforms, according to determined client characteristics . . . , a source 250 into a format acceptable to the client 102.”⁴

Applicants respectfully submit that Tracton fails to remedy the above-noted deficiencies in Craig and Tso. Indeed, the Office appears to acknowledge that Tracton does not disclose or

¹ Craig, col. 10, ll. 41-43.

² Office Action at 4, ll. 14-20.

³ Tso, col. 3, ll. 62-65.

⁴ Tracton, col. 7, ll. 38-43.

suggest the previously recited “means . . . for controlling said means for outputting to output said content data stored by said means for storing without inquiry via the network when said content data is stored in said means for storing.”⁵

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Craig, Tso, and Tracton, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “means . . . for controlling said means for outputting to output said content data stored by said means for storing without an inquiry via the network when said means for detecting detects that said means for storing is storing said content data independently of said page information,” as recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, it is further submitted that amended Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of Craig, Tso, and Tracton.

It is additionally submitted that independent Claims 12-14 (and all associated dependent claims) are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with regard to Claim 1 and for the more detailed features presented in those claims.

⁵ Office Action at 5, ll. 1-3; id., ll. 15-21.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application, including Claims 1-17, is patentably distinguished over the cited art and is in condition for allowance. Such an allowance is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Brian R. Epstein
Registration No. 60,329